

REMARKS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Office Action dated 19 October 2005. Responsive to that Office Action, Claims 1, 3, and 4 are amended for further prosecution with the other pending Claims.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. It is believed that the amendments incorporated into the Claims hereby now remove the noted informalities and obviate the Examiner's formal concerns under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Also in the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 3-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Chen reference. As for Claims 1-2 and 5, the Examiner indicated that they would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection set forth in the Office Action. Independent Claim 1 having now been amended to remove the informalities noted by the Examiner, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-2 and 5 are now in allowable form.

Independent Claim 4 is now amended to recite among its combination of features that of providing respective fastening portions on the top cover and top seat, "wherein at least one of said fastening portions of said top seat defines both a fastening slot for receiving one of said fastening portions of said top cover, and a

hooking portion for engaging said engaging ring of said fastening latch.” An exemplary embodiment illustrating incorporation of such features is shown in Figs. 4 – 5. As the Examiner acknowledged in the Office Action, such structural features are not disclosed by the cited references of record. It is believed, therefore, that Claim 4 is also now in allowable form.

In addition, independent Claim 3 is amended to now more clearly recite among its combination of features a top cover having “an elongate base and at least two retaining portions each protruding transversely therefrom.” As the claim further recites, the top cover is mounted on the top seat such that the “retaining portions of said top cover extend from said elongate base for retentive engagement by retaining slots defined by” corresponding “retaining portions of said top seat.”

The full combination of these and other features as now more clearly recited by newly-amended independent Claim 3 is nowhere disclosed by the cited Chen reference. Note in this regard that Chen’s cover plate 50 which engages the base plate 40 is actually formed with a plurality of accommodating openings 51, 52 through which the base plate’s positioning lugs 41, 42 pass for mated engagement. This departs quite plainly from any top cover “provided with an elongate base and at least two retaining portions each protruding transversely therefrom,” as Claim 3 now more clearly recites. Thus, Chen hardly discloses any such retaining portions actually “extend[ing] from” an “elongate base,” actively precluding as much by its prescribed top plate structure.

MR2549-65

Serial Number: 10/743,798

Reply to Office Action dated 19 October 2005

It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the Chen reference fails to disclose the unique combination of elements now more clearly recited by newly-amended independent Claim 3 for the purposes and objectives disclosed in the subject Patent Application.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed fully in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE



Jun Y. Lee
Registration #40,262

Dated: 1/6/2006

Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678
Customer No. 04586